REMARKS

The office action of November 16, 2007, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-6, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Rockstrom et al. in view of the patent the patent to Cohn.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rockstrom et al. and Cohn, and further in view of the patent to Frye et al.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references and particularly to the patent to Rockstrom et al., it can be seen that this patent discloses a device for slitting and rewinding strips. The exiting web 30 is rolled off a single roll 31 that supports the entire width of the web 30, and is wound onto a further roll 32, and in the region of a cutting roll 33 is cut into small subwebs 30a by slitter wheels

34. Alternate ones of the subwebs 30a are wound on rewind shaft21 and others on rewind shaft 22. For tensioning the subwebs 30a they pass partially around a contact drum 29. In this way the individual subwebs are tensioned and can be wound under tension. Due to this arrangement, a tension-free movement of the subwebs is prevented. The elastic drum 29 is fixed in position and the rewind shafts 21, 22 are at a distance from the drum 29 which distance increases as the diameter of the rewind shafts increases.

In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, a coil of rolled strip is wound and unwound. The coil is supported by its own weight on two spaced troughed rollers. As shown in Fig. 1a, the coil lies on each trough roller with a linear pressure. A marking of the strip results from the weight of the coil being supported along two lines. The object of the present invention is to prevent this marking. For rolling or unrolling, one of the two troughed rollers is driven. Contrary to Rockstrom et al., in the present invention the coil lies across its entire width only on the two lines in contact with the troughed rollers. Furthermore, while Rockstrom et al. use a uniform tension force in the individual subwebs 30a to pull them throough the elastic roll, in the present invention the outer surface of the troughed rollers can deform along the load line when uneven loading is present, so

that the surface of the strip is not damaged.

Thus, applicant submits that Rockstrom et al. has a different construction and operation from the present invention. In Rockstrom et al. the outer surfaces 70 of the annular resilient elements 55 are pressed outwardly when the pulling force of the subwebs 30a reduces, while in the present invention the outer surface of the troughed roller is pushed toward the axis of the roller. In the present invention, the pressing or resting force on the coil is reduced and equalized over the entire width of the coil. The coil rests elastically on the line of the troughed rollers and marking, as is possible with rigid troughed rollers, is prevented. This is not taught by Rockstrom et al.

The patent to Cohn discloses a mandrel and actuator. The Examiner combined Cohn with Rockstrom et al. in determining that claims 1-6, 11 and 12 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant submits that Cohn is not relevant prior art. The coiler of the present invention has troughed rollers that support the outer diameter/surface of the coil. Cohn, on the other hand teaches a mandrel that supports the inner diameter of the coil. This is a completely different principal than the present invention. Furthermore, Cohn does not even teach a troughed

roller, but instead, as mentioned previously, a mandrel around which a coil can be wound. The mandrel of Cohn can be expanded outwardly in that it has segments that can be moved radially outward by inner bars. Such mandrels are used for expanding the inner diameter of the wound coil to permit removal of the mandrel from the coil. Without such an expansion capability, removal of the mandrel would damage the surface of the rolled metal and/or pull the innermost coils out of the overall coil.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither of these references, nor their combination, teach a coiler device having an outer collar uniformly supported by support members that are spring-tensioned from the inside by disk springs against the outer collar, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-6, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Frye et al. discloses a compliant drum and rider roll. The Examiner combined Frye et al., Rockstrom et al. and Cohn in determining that claims 7-10 would be unpatentable

over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that none of these references, nor their combination, teach a coiler device having an outer collar uniformly supported by support members that are spring-tensioned from the inside by disk springs against the outer collar, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By

Klaus P. Stoffe1/

Reg. No. 31,668 For: Friedrich Kueffner

Reg. No. 29,482

317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910

New York, New York 10017

(212) 986-3114

Dated: March 17, 2008



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 17, 2008.

By:

Date: March 17, 2008